MOTION FILED
MAY 2 2 2006

31

No. 05 - 380

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES, *Petitioner*

v.

LEROY CARHART, ET AL, *Respondents*

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE WITH BRIEF BY LEGAL DEFENSE FOR UNBORN CHILDREN IN SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY

ALAN ERNEST
Counsel

P.O. BOX 4041
RIO RICO, AZ 85648
(520) 281-7513

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE BY THE LEGAL DEFENSE FOR UNBORN CHILDREN IN SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY

Interest of *Amicus Curiae*

The *amicus curiae* proves that the U.S. Constitution's universal guarantee of life to "any person," made in its Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, does include the unborn.

The parties have not done this.

Consent to File

The petitioner, *Gonzales*, consented to the filing of this brief, but the respondents, *Carhart, et al.*, refused to consent.

Argument

The *amicus curiae* proves that the U.S. Constitution's universal guarantee of life to "any person," made in its Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, does include the unborn.

Consequently, *Roe v. Wade*, 40 U.S. 113 (1973), is unconstitutional and invalid, and it must be overruled.

This disposes of all issues in this case.

Conclusion

Wherefore, counsel asks the court to grant this motion for leave to file this *amicus curiae* brief.

Alan Ernest
Counsel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Interest of *Amicus Curiae*.....1
Summary of Argument.....1
Argument

I. THE U.S. CONSTITUTION'S GUARANTEE OF LIFE TO "ANY PERSON" DOES INCLUDE THE UNBORN..1

A. On its face, the Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person" does include the unborn.....1

B. The spirit of the law proves that the Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person" does include the unborn 3

C. History confirms that the Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person" does include the unborn.....4

II. *ROE* v. *WADE* IS VOID BECAUSE IT CRIMINALLY DEFIED THE U.S. CONSTITUTION'S GUARANTEE OF LIFE TO "ANY PERSON," AND CONDEMNED TO DEATH MILLIONS OF VICTIMS WHOM THE CONSTITUTION ENDEAVORS TO PRESERVE.....7

A. *Roe* v. *Wade* criminally defied the Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person" because the Court decreed killings to be "liberty" which the people had defined to be "murder." In effect, the Court decreed MASS MURDER IS LIBERTY.....7

1. The Court decreed killings to be "liberty" which Americans had defined to be "murder" since earliest colonial times 9

Table of Contents - *Continued*

2. The Court decreed killings to be "liberty" which the framers and adopters of the Fourteenth Amendment defined to be "murder."....10

3. The U.S. Supreme Court and the U.S. Government claim power to decree the mass murder of Jews, or anyone else, to be liberty....11

4. The U.S. Supreme Court has committed treason to the U.S. Constitution....13

5. The United States being ruled by a giant conspiracy to mass murder is the most catastrophic crime in the history of civilization....15

B. *Roe* v. *Wade* criminally defied the Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person" because the Court defied the rulings of Chief Justice John Marshall and used a "Guilty Until Proven Innocent" burden of proof to imply that the words "any person" did not include the unborn....15

C. *Roe* v. *Wade* criminally defied the Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person" because the Court used criminal procedures to conclude that the words "any person" do not include the unborn....18

D. *Roe* v. *Wade* criminally defied the Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person" because the Court fabricated false evidence to imply that the words "any person" do not include the unborn....18

Table of Contents - Continued

E. Due process of law has compelled the U.S. Supreme Court to confess in court that it is guilty of extermination and murder.....26

III. IF *ROE* v. *WADE* IS A MISTAKE OF LAW, THEN ALL PUBLIC OFFICIALS, OR CITIZENS, WHO SUPPORT IT MAY BE GUILTY OF COMPLICITY IN EXTERMINATION, INCLUDING MASS MURDER.....28

Conclusion.....30

Table of Authorities

Cases:

Baxter v. *Palmigiano*, 425 U.S. 308 (1976).....26

Bennett v. *State*, 377 P 2d 634 (1963).....11

Clarke v. *State*, 117 Ala. 1 (1898).....10, 11

Cohens v. *Virginia*, 6 Wheat. 264 (1821).....14

Dartmouth College v. *Woodward*, 4 Wheat. 518 (1819)...16

Dred Scott v. *Sanford*, 19 How. 393 (1857).....4, 5, 6

Ernest v. *U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, U.S. Attorney General*, cert. denied 475 U.S. 1085 (1986).....12, 13

Ernest v. *Rehnquist, Stevens, Breyer O'Connor, Scalia, Souter, Thomas, Ginsburg, etc., U.S. Attorney, etc., U.S. Attorney General*, in the U.S. District Court in Alexandria, Civil No. 89-732A.....13

Federal Constitutional Court of West Germany, 1 BVerfG 39, reported in R. Destro, *Abortion and the Constitution: The Need for a Life Protective Amendment*, 63 Cal. L. Rev. 1250 (1975).....3, 25

Gulf, Colo. and S. Fe RR v. *Ellis*, 165 U.S. 150 (1896).....3-4

Hamilton v. *United States*, 26 App D.C. 382 (1905).....10

Lamb v. *State*, 67 Md. 524 (1887).....19

Table of Authorities - *Continued*

Marbury v. *Madison*, 1 Cranch 137 (1803).....13, 27

Mills v. *Comm.*, 13 Pa. 631 (1850).....19, 25

Ogden v. *Saunders*, 12 Wheat. 213 (1827).....13

People v. *Chavez*, 77 Cal. App 2d 621 (1947) 8, 11

Pollard v. *Dwight*, 4 Cranch 421(1807).....11

Porter v. *Lasiter*, 87 SE 2d 100 (1955).....11

Regina v. *West*, 2 C & K 784 (1848).....9

Ross v. Oregon, 227 U.S. 150 (1912).....28

Santa Clara v. *So. Pac. RR*, 118 U.S. 394 (1886).....16

Singleton v. *State*, 35 So 2d 375 (1948).....11

Smith v. *State*, 33 Me. 48 (1851).....22

State v. *Anderson*, 343 A. 2d 505 (1975).....11

State v. *Reed*, 45 Ark. 333 (1885).....19

State v. *Slagle*, 83 N.C. 544 (1880).....19

Sturges v. *Crowninshield*, 4 Wheat. 122 (1819).....16

United States v. *Altstoetter* [The Justice Case],
3 Trials of War Criminals Before the
Nuernberg Military Tribunals (1951).....14

United States v. *Hale*, 422 U.S. 171(1975).....27

Table of Authorities - *Continued*

Watson v. *State*, 117 A 2d 549 (1955).....11

Yick Wo v. *Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356(1986) 16

Texts

J. Archbold, *Complete Treatise on Criminal Procedure, Pleading and Evidence* (7th ed. 1860).....9

J. Bishop, *Commentaries on the Criminal Law* (4th ed. 1868).....10-11

Black's Law Dictionary (Rev. 4th ed. 1968).....17

Blackstone, *Commentaries* 9, 29

L. Burdick, 2 *The Law of Crime* (1946).....11

Winston Churchill, *The Gathering Storm* 262 (1948).....29

Coke, *Institutes* 9, 11

T. Denman, M.D., *Introduction to the Practice of Midwifery* (1802).....20, 21

Alan Ernest, *Mass Murder Is Liberty: How The United States Is Ruled By the Decree MASS MURDER IS LIBERTY* (1998).....29

The Federalist, No. 10 (James Madison).....1

Hawkins, *Pleas of the Crown*.....9

H. Hodge, M.D., *The Principles and Practice of Obstetrics* (1864).....24, 25

Table of Authorities - *Continued*

O.W. Holmes, *The Common Law* (Howe ed.1963).....28

T. Jefferson, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (Berg ed. 1907).....9

A. Lincoln, *Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* (R. Basler ed. 1953).....2, 5

McCormick's Handbook of the Law of Evidence (Cleary ed. 1972).....26

G. Orwell, *1984* (1949).....29

R. Perkins, *Perkins on Criminal Law* (2d ed. 1969).....11, 28

Plato (Jowett translation, 1942).....26

F. Rambotham, M.D., *Principles and Practice of Obstetric Medicine* (4th ed. 1856).....21

W. O. Russell, 1 *Treatise on Crimes and Misdemeanors* (4th ed. 1865).....9

B. Schwartz, *Statutory History of the United States: Civil Rights* (1970).....6

H.R. Storer, M.D., *On Criminal Abortion in America* (1860).....22-23

A. S. Taylor, *Manual of Medical Jurisprudence* (Penrose Am. ed., 6th ed. 1854).....10, 11

A. Velpeau, M.D., *Complete Treatise on Midwifery* (4th Am. ed. 1854).....21

Table of Authorities - *Continued*

G. Washington, *The Writings of George Washington* (Fitzpatrick ed. 1940).....14

F. Wharton, *A Treatise on the Criminal Law of the United States* (5th ed. 1861).....22

F. Wharton, *Wharton's Criminal Law and Procedure* (12th ed. 1957).....11

F. Wharton, *Treatise on the Law of Homicide in the United States* (1855).....11

Wigmore, *Evidence* (Chadborn Rev. 1972).....26

Motions and Briefs Filed in this Court:

Brief on behalf of the State of Georgia, *Doe* v. *Bolton*, 410 U.S. 179 (1973).....7

Brief on behalf of the State of Texas, *Roe* v. *Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973) 4

Motion to Allow Counsel to Represent Children Unborn and Born Alive, filed in this case.....18

Articles and Reports

Hearings on Constitutional Amendments on Abortion, before subcomm. On Civil and Constitutional Rights, of the House Comm. of the Judiciary, 94th Cong., 2d Session, Ser. 46, Part 1 at 397 (1976).....7-8

L.S. Joynes, M.D., *Foetus in Utero*, Virginia Med. J. (1856).....23, 24

Model Penal Code (Proposed Official Draft 1962)..... 28

Table of Authorities - *Continued*

R. Penrose M.D., *Discourse on the Life of H.L. Hodge* (1872).....25

E. Quay, *Justifiable Abortion: Medical and Legal Foundations*, 49 Geo. L.J. 395 (1961).....19

Transactions of the American Medical Association (1860).....24

U.S. Constitution:

Fifth Amendment

Guarantee of life to "any person".....1-7

Burdens of proof 15-18

Silence as confession 26-29

Fifth and Sixth Amendment:

Assistance of counsel.....18

Prior notice 18

Secret proceedings 18

Confrontation 18

Presenting evidence 18

Fourteenth Amendment

Guarantee of life to "any person" 1-7

INTEREST OF THE AMICUS CURIAE

The *amicus* defends the constitutional right to life of unborn children which the parties have not done.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The U.S. Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person," made in its 5th and 14th Amendments, does include the unborn.

ARGUMENT

I.

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION'S GUARANTEE OF LIFE TO "ANY PERSON" DOES INCLUDE THE UNBORN.

The Declaration of Independence announced that reverence for life is America's founding principle. It said that all men are created equal, all are endowed by their Creator with an unalienable right to life, and the purpose of government is to protect the life of everyone.

America told the world that if we will follow our reverence for life wherever it may lead, then a future of more abundant life, which we can look forward to with hope, will unfold before us. On the other hand, Madison warned that the primitive idea, that some can gain by harming others, had ruined all democracies known to history.[1] And the lethal inventions of science have made reverence for life the only way to the future.

A. On its Face, the U.S. Constitution's Guarantee of Life to "Any Person" Does Include the Unborn

This guarantee of life to everyone was incorporated into the U.S. Constitution. The 14th Amendment's guarantee of life reads: "(N)or shall any State deprive ***any person*** of

---

[1] *The Federalist*, No. 10 (James Madison).

Rule 37.6 disclosure: Counsel authored the whole *amicus* brief; no monetary contributors are required to be identified.

life...without due process of law." (emphasis added).

The words "any person" are universal, admit of no exceptions for anyone, make no distinction between born and unborn life, and on their face include the unborn, the same as everyone else. The obvious purpose of guaranteeing life universally to "any person" was to prohibit government officials making exceptions so some persons could be exterminated.

The Court admitted that if the word "person" included the unborn, then *Roe* v. *Wade* "collapses," because the lives of the unborn would be "guaranteed" by the Constitution.[2] But the Court implied that "the word 'person,' as used in the Fourteenth Amendment, does not include the unborn."[3] Thus the Court hit the Constitution head-on, directly defied its express prohibition of extermination, and condemned to death those victims whom the Constitution, by its plain words, endeavors to preserve.

The words "any person" are the two most important words ever written into law because they protect the lives of everybody from extermination, and they summarize America's unique contribution to civilization. As Lincoln said, what made America great was the promise "that ***all*** should have an equal chance."[4] (emphasis in text).

The words "any person" are the words which guarantee that equal chance to live to ***all***, they stand as the supreme political achievement of the human race, the prize of millenniums of struggle. If the Constitution had stated it protected the life of "any person - except the unborn," then its words would support *Roe* v. *Wade*. But its words say "any person," without any exceptions.

The Court ruled that the words "any person" included

---

[2] *Roe* v. *Wade*, 410 U.S. 113, 156-157 (1973).

[3] *Id.*, at 158.

[4] 4 *Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* 240 (R. Basler ed. 1953).

Chinese aliens, merely saying the words are "universal in their application, to all persons...without regard to any differences." *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 369 (1886).

In 1975, the Supreme Court of West Germany held that the words in its Constitution, "Everybody has the right to life," did include the unborn. It explained that the word "everybody" is universal.

But in *Roe* v. *Wade*, the Court ignored the letter of the law. Instead the Court focused on the isolated word "person," and ignored its modifier "any." Yet "any" is the word which means "all," and extends the right to life to everyone without any exceptions.

By reading the universal guarantee of life to "any person" as if it were merely a guarantee to "some persons," the Court did the most forbidden thing, and reduced the most important law in history to nothing.

The Constitution extends its guarantee of life to "any person." The letter of the law permits no exceptions. On their face the universal words "any person" do include the unborn.

B. The Spirit of the Law Proves that the U.S. Constitution's Guarantee of Life to "Any Person" Does Include the Unborn

Roe v. *Wade* violates the spirit of the law, as well as its letter. The Court itself ruled that the Declaration of Independence is the spirit of the Constitution:

> The first official action of this nation declared the foundation of government in these words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life..." While such declaration of principles may not have the force of organic law...yet the latter is but the body and the letter of which the former is the thought and the spirit, and it is always safe to read the letter of the Constitution in the spirit of

> the Declaration of Independence. No duty rests more imperatively upon the courts than...to secure the equality of rights which is the foundation of free government.
> *Gulf, Colo. & S. Ry* v. *Ellis*, 165 U.S. at 159-160 (1896).

There is no real medical dispute that the unborn have been created and are alive.[5] So reading the letter of the Constitution, the universal guarantee of life to "any person," in the spirit that ***all*** are "created equal," and ***all*** shall get their chance to live, permits only one conclusion - that the words "any person" do include the unborn.

C. History Confirms that the Constitution's Guarantee of Life to "Any Person" Does Include the Unborn

In addition to the letter and spirit of the law, the universal embrace of this guarantee of life to "any person" is also evident from its history. The last time the Court implied an exception to the words "any person" was *Dred Scott* v. *Sandford*, 19 How. 393 (1857). There the Court ruled that: the word "person," as used in the Fifth Amendment, did not include Negroes because they were not persons in the whole sense; the phrase in the Declaration of Independence, "all men are created equal," did not include Negroes; there was a constitutional right to own a slave ("the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution"); Congress could not prohibit slavery in the territories; people were free to choose whether or not to own slaves; and Negroes could not sue in federal courts to see if they were slave or free.

Abraham Lincoln opposed the *Dred Scott* decision. If officials can say all men are created equal except Negroes, he

---

[5] The medical evidence in the Texas brief in *Roe v. Wade* showed the fetal heart begins "pulsations at 24 days," and "brain waves have been noted at 43 days," and the unborn child is "alive."

asked, "where will it stop?"[6] If officials can say the Declaration does not include blacks, Lincoln argued that they can say it doesn't include any other person. He claimed *Dred Scott* was based on "falsehood."[7] He alleged a conspiracy by the U.S. Supreme Court, two U.S. Presidents, and leading members of Congress to overturn the U.S. Constitution and impose a slave empire on America.[8]

Lincoln said he would not obey *Dred Scott*. Citing both Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson as authority,[9] he said the president swears an oath to obey the Constitution as he understands it, and not as it was understood by the Supreme Court. If the president were bound by *Dred Scott*, Lincoln explained in his First Inaugural Address, "the people will have ceased, to be their own rulers."[10]

Dred Scott triggered a civil war. Various States withdrew from the Union rather than be deprived of their constitutional right to own a slave, as decreed by the Court. President Lincoln defied the Court's *Dred Scott* decision, that there was a constitutional right to own a slave, because he emancipated the slaves and declared them to be "forever free."[11] He reminded us at Gettysburg that we were fighting to see whether a nation dedicated to the proposition that "all men are created equal" could long endure.

One of the framers of 14th Amendment explained that its purpose was to rededicate America to its original proposition: "It establishes equality before the law, and it gives to the humblest...the most despised...the same protection before the law as it gives to the most powerful....Without this...there is no republican government." Rep. Jacob Howard, quoted in

---

[6] 2 *Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* 500 (R. Basler ed. 1953).
[7] *Id.*, 495.
[8] *Id.*, at 461-469, 521.
[9] *Id.*, at 402, 516-17.
[10] 4 *Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* 268 (R. Balser ed. 1953).
[11] 6 *Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* 28-30 (R. Balser ed. 1953).

B. Schwartz, 1 *Statutory History of the United States: Civil Rights* 262 (1970).

The framers of the Fourteenth Amendment learned from *Dred Scott*. They said the Supreme Court must never again imply exceptions to the words "any person." They employed the universal words most suited for this purpose.

And by the middle of the 19th century, medical science had discovered that an unborn child was alive throughout gestation, and there was no time during gestation when science could draw a line and say the unborn were not alive. By the time the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted in 1868, the vast majority of States had already enacted criminal abortion laws to protect all stages of unborn life, and within a few years such laws were universal.

The history of these criminal abortion laws shows that the framers and adopters of the Fourteenth Amendment intended its universal guarantee of life to "any person" to mean what it says, and to include the unborn the same as everyone else.

Yet *Roe* v. *Wade* is another *Dred Scott* disaster. The Court assumes that, without one word of explanation, the framers intended their guarantee of life to "any person" to sweep away all their abortion statutes and make the killings, which they said were criminal, into "liberty." The Court assumes that the framers connived to repudiate a major point of the Civil War, so judges would again be at liberty, as in *Dred Scott*, to convulse society by implying more exceptions to the words "any person." And the Court amends the Declaration of Independence to read "all men are created equal - except those created to be killed." The Court claims it can decree who was created to be killed.

The Court did the most forbidden thing: it directly defied the Constitution's express guarantee of life to "any person," and decreed criminal extermination to be legal.

The Fourteenth Amendment's letter, spirit, and history allow only one conclusion: the express and universal guarantee of life to "any person" does include the unborn.

II.

ROE v. *WADE* IS VOID BECAUSE IT CRIMINALLY DEFIED THE CONSTITUTION'S GUARANTEE OF LIFE TO "ANY PERSON" AND CONDEMNED TO DEATH MILLIONS OF VICTIMS WHOM THE CONSTITUTION ENDEAVORS TO PRESERVE.

A.

Roe v. Wade Criminally Defied the Constitution's Guarantee of Life to "Any Person" Because the Court Decreed Killings to Be "Liberty" Which the People Had Defined to Be "Murder." In Effect, the Court Decreed MASS MURDER IS LIBERTY.

When *Roe* v. *Wade* was decided in 1973, an abortion was murder if the child was "born alive." A child could be "born alive" during second or third trimester abortions. Indeed, the State of Georgia forewarned the Court that certain abortions were "murder."[12] But the Court scorned that warning and decreed those very killings to be "liberty."[13]

In 1976, a physician explained to Congress that *Roe* v. *Wade* permitted second trimester hysterotomy abortions, and children killed by this abortion procedure can be "born alive":

> "With few exceptions, babies aborted by this method will all move, will all breathe, and some will cry.... Almost all were **born alive**."[14] (emphasis added)

The physician showed Congress this photograph of a child

---

[12] *Doe* v. *Bolton*, 410 U.S. 179 (1973), Brief for Appellees 52-53.

[13] *Roe* v. *Wade*, 410 U.S. 113, 153 (1973). The Court decreed a right to abortion to be "founded in the Fourteenth Amendment's concept of personal liberty."

[14] Hearings on Constitutional Amendments on Abortion, before subcomm. On Civil and Constitutional Rights, of the House Comm. Of the Judiciary, 94th Cong., 2d Session, Ser. 46, Part 1 at 397 (1976).

killed by a salt poisoning abortion. He said this method could also result in a child being "born still alive."

For almost four centuries, Americans had defined such killings to be "murder." But in 1973 the Court decreed such killings to be "liberty."

And by 1973, States had decided that in the third trimester a child need not be "born alive," but was a human being within their homicide or murder statutes if the child were killed "in the process of being born."[15] But the Court also decreed those murders to be "liberty."[16] Indeed under *Roe* v. *Wade* doctors kill children in the very process of being born.

---

[15] *People* v. *Chavez*, 77 Cal. App. 2d 621, 626 (1947).

[16] *Doe* v. *Bolton*, 410 U.S. 179 (1973). The Court decreed that abortions could be performed in the third trimester to protect the woman's "health," which the Court ruled included "all factors - physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the woman's age - relevant to the well being of the patient." In effect, this too is abortion on demand.

1. The Court Decreed Killings to Be "Liberty" Which Americans Had Condemned as "Murder" Since Earliest Colonial Times.

America's first settlement at Jamestown followed the English common law, as did other colonies. The common law defined an abortion, in which a "quick" (about 4 months gestation) child died after being "born alive," to be "murder."[17] Even if not yet viable, if the child was "born alive," Coke (the standard 17th century legal authority) condemned the abortion as "so horrible an offense" and "this is murder."[18] Jefferson wrote that Coke's work was "the fundamental code of English law"[19] which makes it a foundation of American liberty.

The English writers cited this as the correct statement of the law.[20] And English courts followed this law.[21]

The English common law was the law of the land in colonial America. By allowing second and third trimester abortions, the Court decreed killings to be "liberty" which Americans had defined to be "murder" since earliest colonial times.

---

[17] Coke, 3 *Inst.* 50; Hawkins, 1 *Hawkins* Ch. 13, s. 16; Blackstone, 4 *Bl. Com.* 198.

[18] Coke, 3 *Institutes* 50.

[19] Jefferson wrote of Coke's *Institutes*: "This work is executed with so much learning and judgment, that I do not recollect that a single position in it has ever been judicially denied....It may still be considered as the fundamental code of English law." Thomas Jefferson, 14 *Writings of Thomas Jefferson* 57 (1907). Jefferson served on the 1776 committee which adapted Virginia's laws to republican form, the common law being assigned to him.

[20] J.F. Archbold, 1 *Complete Treatise on Criminal Procedure, Pleading and Evidence* 783 (Waterman Am. Ed. 7th ed. 1860); W.O. Russell, 1 *Treatise on Crimes and Misdemeanors* 671-672 (4th ed. 1865).

[21] *Regina* v. *West*, 2 C & K 784 (1848).

2. The Court Decreed Killings to Be "Liberty" which the Framers and Adopters of the Fourteenth Amendment Had Defined to Be "Murder."

The English common law is the dictionary which American courts use to construe the state and federal homicide statutes.[22]

By the time the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted in 1868, American legal authorities and State supreme courts had long followed the common law rule that second and third trimester abortions were murder if the child were born alive. And viability was irrelevant. If death were caused by the child being too immature to survive outside the womb, the abortion was murder.

In 1859 the American Medical Association reported the law of murder which existed throughout the United States:

> If a person, intending to procure abortion, does an act which causes the child to be born earlier than its natural time, and therefore in a state much less capable of living, and it afterwards die in consequence of such premature exposure, the person who by this misconduct brings the child into the world, and puts it into a situation in which it cannot live, is guilty of ***murder***.[23] (emphasis added).

This was the uncontradicted view in the United States when the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted.[24] This definition of murder was approved by the preeminent legal

---

[22] *Clarke* v. *State*, 117 Ala. 1 (1898); *Hamilton* v. *United States*, 26 App. D.C. 382 (1905).

[23] Reported in A. S. Taylor, *A Manual of Medical Jurisprudence* 462 (6th ed. 1866). He described the AMA report as "a complete and comprehensive exhibit of laws of each of the United States." Id., at 460.

[24] J. P. Bishop, 2 *Commentaries on the Criminal Law* 365 (4th ed. 1868); A. S. Taylor, *supra* note 23, at 462, 517 (1866).

writers of the 19th century,[25] and it was adopted by State supreme courts.[26] It was still the law in 1973.[27] In 1975 the New Jersey courts applied this law of murder to an unviable fetus born alive:

> That a fetus may be the victim of murder if it be born alive has long been a part of our common law....Coke, *Institutes* 58 (1648).[28]

For almost four centuries governments came and went in America, but this law of murder endured as the law of the land. And it is binding on the U.S. Supreme Court.[29]

Yet the Court ruled that States could not protect unborn life until the third trimester which the Court set at viability- "about 7 months."[30] But in effect (due to the Court's definition of the mother's "health") States could not protect unborn life anytime prior to actual birth. Thus the Court decreed both second and third trimester abortions to be "liberty" which the framers and adopters of the Fourteenth Amendment had defined to be "murder."

---

[25] F. Wharton, *A Treatise on the Law of Homicide in the United States* 93 (1855); Bishop, *supra* note 24; Taylor, *supra* note.23.

[26] *Clarke* v. *State*, 117 Ala. 1 (1898); *Watson* v. *State*, 117 A 2d 549 (1955); *Porter* v. *Lassiter*, 87 S. E. 2d 100 (1955); *People* v. *Chavez* 176 P. 2d 92 (1947); *Bennett* v. *State*, 377 P.2d 634 (1947); *Singleton* v. *State*, 35 So. 2d 375 (1948).

[27] 2 L. Burdick, *The Law of Crime* 156 (1946); 1 *Wharton's Criminal Law and Procedure* 434 (12th ed. 1957); R. Perkins, *Criminal Law* 30 (2d ed. 1969).

[28] *State* v. *Anderson*, 343 A. 2d 505, 508 (1975), aff'd 413A.2d 611 (1980). The court rejected the claim it was not murder because "the infants were never capable of maintaining a separate and independent existence." *Id.* at 615.

[29] The Court must accept the construction given by a state to its own statute. *Pollard* v. *Dwight*, 4 Cranch 421, 429.

[30] *Roe* v. *Wade*, supra, 160, 163.

3. The U.S. Supreme Court and the U.S. Government Claim Power to Decree the Mass Murder of Jews, or Anyone Else, to Be Liberty.

Of course, if the U.S. Supreme Court can decree the mass murder of some persons to be liberty, then it can decree the mass murder of anybody to be liberty.

Indeed, when the U.S. Supreme Court was accused of mass murder in the U.S. District Courts, the U.S. Government defended its Justices by expressly claiming that its Supreme Court must be obeyed even if it decreed the mass murder of Jews, or anyone else, to be liberty. An incredulous U.S. District Judge asked the U.S Government:

> **[U.S. District Judge]: Let me ask you to respond to this question. The plaintiff argues in his brief that the Supreme Court in *Roe v. Wade* took a discrete group of entities and said that these entities have no right to live, and thus may be killed .... And he said if you take *Roe v. Wade* and remove the word "fetus" and just substitute most any other word you want of another discrete group, that we wouldn't be here discussing this at all. Let's say that instead of "fetus," they said "Jews." That is the one he used in his brief.**
>
> **Would you argue stare decisis to me if,under Roe v. Wade, at the whim of neighbors Jews could be put to death?**
>
> **[U.S. Govt. Lawyer]: (I) would have to agree with the doctrine of stare decisis and advance it to the court.**[31]

---

[31] *Ernest* v. *U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia and U.S. Attorney General*, U.S. District Court in Richmond, Civ. No. 84-0858, transcript of proceedings at 21-22. This complaint attacked the validity of *Roe* v. *Wade* on the grounds that the U.S. Supreme Court cannot lawfully decree mass murder to be liberty. It demanded that the District

As victims were being killed in defiance of murder statutes, the U.S. District Judge adopted the U.S. Government's claim that he must obey the U.S. Supreme Court even if it decreed the mass murder of Jews, or anyone else, to be liberty. And on review, not one Justice had any objection to this ruling.[32]

And the Justices were accused of mass murder in a U.S. District Court on the grounds they cannot lawfully decree mass murder to be liberty. Each Justice defended himself or herself by claiming all lower courts must obey the U.S. Supreme Court "no matter how misguided" its decrees may appear to be.[33]

Thus both the U.S. Government and its U.S. Supreme Court maintain the killings by officially claiming the power to decree the mass murder of Jews, or anyone else, to be liberty.

4. The U.S. Supreme Court Has Committed Treason to the U.S. Constitution.

Chief Justice John Marshall would have called *Roe* v. *Wade* "treason to the Constitution." In *Marbury* v. *Madison*, he wrote that the purpose of the Constitution was to control the government, including judges, and the intention of its framers is the law.[34] He later ruled that the Court could not extend the Constitution "to objects not...contemplated by its framers."[35] And Marshall warned that if the Court usurped

---

Judge refuse to obey *Roe* v. *Wade*.

[32] *Ernest* v. *U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, and U.S. Attorney General*, cert. Denied 475 U.S. 1084 (1986).

[33] *Ernest* v. *Rehnquist, Stevens, Breyer, O'Connor, Scalia, Kennedy, Souter, Thomas, Ginsburg, etc., U.S. Attorney, etc., U.S. Attorney General*, et al, U.S. District Court in Alexandria, Civil No. 89-732-A, Defendants' *Motion to Dismiss*, page 3. The District Court adopted this argument as law by summary decree, refusing to even allow a hearing.

[34] *Marbury* v. *Madison* at 176-180 (1803).

[35] *Ogden* v. *Saunders*, 12 Wheat. at 332 (1827).

such power, it would be "treason to the Constitution."[36]

The officials to be controlled are not free to invent a constitution more to their liking. Lawless officials can overthrow a constitution as surely as armed rebels. Indeed President George Washington warned that "change by usurpation" was "the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."[37]

By decreeing killings to be "liberty" which the framers had defined to be "murder," the Court exactly extended the Constitution to objects not contemplated by its framers. The Court confronts the nation with the boldest and plainest case of officials committing "treason to the Constitution."

By merely changing the names of the victims being killed, the U.S. Supreme Court has duplicated the decree of "the supreme judge" of Nazi Germany. At Nuremberg the Nazi judges claimed they could not be prosecuted for complicity in extermination and murder because "the supreme judge" had decreed the killing of Jews and other minorities to be legal, and they were obligated to obey the decrees of their supreme judge.[38] But the United States prosecuted Nazi judges for obeying their supreme judge.

Now U.S. officials conspire to impose the same Nazi doctrines on the United States which the United States itself prosecuted as extermination and murder at Nuremberg. This

---

[36] *Cohens* v. *Virginia*, 6 Wheat. at 404 (1821).

[37] George Washington, 35 *The Writings of George Washington* 229 (Fitzpatrick ed. 1940). (Washington's Farewell Address)

[38] *United States* v. *Altstoetter*, 3 Trials of War Criminals Before the Nuernberg Military Tribunals 1011-1014 (1951). Hitler claimed the emergency provisions of the Weimar Constitution gave him power to act as "the supreme judge." As such he decreed the killing of Jews and other minorities to be legal. Nazi judges claimed they could not be held accountable for complicity in extermination and murder, since they had acted "within the authority" of the "decrees" of "the supreme judge." *Id.* at 983-85. But the Tribunal rejected that defense: "The dagger of the assassin was concealed beneath the robe of the jurist." *Id.*, at 985.

Court claims power to decree the mass murder of Jews, or anyone else, to be legal; and government officials claim they must obey such decrees.

America has surrendered the promise that everybody has an unalienable right to life and the purpose of government is to protect the life of everyone. Now the lives of all Americans depend on the whim of government officials, as in Stalin's Russia or Hitler's Germany.

When U.S. Officials conspire to impose Nazi doctrines on the United States, then no honest person can doubt that these officials have committed treason to the U.S. Constitution.

5. The United States Being Ruled By a Giant Conspiracy to Mass Murder Is the Most Catastrophic Crime in the History of Civilization.

But if U.S. Officials cannot lawfully decree mass murder to be liberty, then the United States is now being ruled by a giant conspiracy to mass murder - a conspiracy by the leading U.S. Officials to kill children in defiance of murder statutes.

America introduced civilization to the idea that reverence for life is the future for the world. Yet America is now ruled by the most corrupt decree which the human mind can even imagine - MASS MURDER IS LIBERTY. And government is reduced to the mere matter of which mass murderer can grab power, issue orders, and be blindly obeyed.

The U.S. Government knows how to make atomic bombs, but it does not know the difference between mass murder and liberty. This is the vision which America now holds out to guide the future of the world. Now we all descend into a terrifying darkness.

B.

Roe v. Wade Criminally Defied the Constitution's Guarantee of Life to "Any Person" Because the Court Defied the Rulings of John Marshall and Used a "Guilty Until Proven Innocent" Burden of Proof to Imply that the Words "Any Person" Do Not Include the Unborn.

The Court used the correct burden of proof when it previously construed these universal words "any person."[39] Yet in *Roe* v. *Wade*, the Court actually reversed the burdens.

1.

Chief Justice John Marshall explained what the Court must prove in order to imply an exception to express and universal terms in the U.S. Constitution.

As already described, the words "any person" are express and universal, and on their face include the unborn, the same as everybody else. In order to imply an exception to exclude the unborn from the universal guarantee of life, so they can be killed with impunity from criminal laws, the Court must prove that including the unborn within the terms "any person" would be "so monstrous, that all mankind would, without hesitation, unite in rejecting the application."[40]

And the Court must prove that if the right to life of the unborn had "been suggested [to the framers] the language would have been so varied, as to exclude it."[41] The Court

---

[39] The Court ruled the words "any person" included Chinese aliens ("subjects of the emperor of China") merely saying the words are "universal." *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 369 (1886).

And the Court was so sure that the words "any person" included "corporations" it refused to allow counsel to argue against it. *Santa Clara* v. *So. Pac. RR*, 118 U.S. 394, 396 (1886).

[40] *Sturges* v. *Crowninshield*, 4 Wheat. 122, 202-203 (1819). When the Constitution uses universal words, and a case is "within the very words of the Constitution," the Court may not infer an exception unless the "absurdity and injustice of applying the provision to the case, would be so monstrous, that all mankind would, without hesitation, unite in rejecting the application."

[41] *Dartmouth College* v. *Woodward*, 4 Wheat. 518, 644-45 (1819). When the Constitution uses universal words, " It is not enough to say that this particular case was not in the mind of the Convention, when the article was framed, nor of the American people, when it was adopted. It is necessary to go farther, and to say that, had this particular case been suggested, the language would have been so varied, as to exclude it, or it would have been made a special exception."

must prove that the framers would have changed the Fourteenth Amendment to read: "Nor shall any State deprive any person, **except unborn persons**, of life without due process of law."

These are the burdens which protect the lives of all Americans from government sanctioned extermination, as happened in Hitler's Germany, or Stalin's Russia. Obviously, the Court must bear the heaviest burden of proof in order to imply an exception to the Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person" so millions of victims can be killed with impunity from criminal statutes.

Under Chief Justice Marshall's rules, the Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person" does include the unborn because "all mankind" would not unite "without hesitation" to exclude the unborn. And the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment would not have changed its guarantee of life to read "any person - except the unborn." The framers and adopters had already enacted criminal statutes to protect the lives of the unborn throughout gestation, and some abortions were murder. Thus there is no doubt that this universal guarantee of life to "any person" does include the unborn.

2.

But in *Roe v. Wade* the Court exactly reversed the burdens of proof described by Chief Justice John Marshall. The Court said that the evidence did not prove "with any ***assurance***"[42] that the guarantee of life to "any person" included the unborn. Assurance means "To make certain and put beyond doubt."[43]

First, the Court assumed that the words "any person" did not include the unborn, and then it placed the burden on the unborn to prove with "assurance," to prove beyond doubt, that the words "any person" did include the unborn.

---

[42] *Roe* v. *Wade*, 410 U.S. at 157. (emphasis added).

[43] *Black's Law Dictionary* (4th ed. 1968).

Thus the Court made the legitimacy of *Roe* v. *Wade* rest on doubt. It presumed that doubts about the legality of the killings created a constitutional right to kill. Somehow confusion about the right to kill creates the right to kill.

When courts use this burden of proof to condemn tens of millions of victims to death, Americans can not pretend they still have a government of Constitution and laws.

The Court claims it can use this burden of proof to decree the extermination of anyone to be liberty.

C.

***Roe* v. *Wade* Criminally Defied the Constitution's Guarantee of Life to "Any Person" Because The Court Used Criminal Procedures to Conclude that the Words "Any Person" Do Not Include the Unborn.**

Roe v. Wade was a mock trial designed to exclude truth.

And the Court maintains its killings with mock trials. It refuses to allow counsel to represent the unborn and defend their right to life. It refuses to allow its false evidence in *Roe v. Wade*, which it used to imply that the words "any person" did not include the unborn, to be confronted and cross-examined. It refuses to allow evidence to be presented to show the Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person" does include the unborn.[44]

D.

***Roe* v. *Wade* Criminally Defied the Constitution's Guarantee of Life to "Any Person" Because the Court Fabricated False Evidence to Conclude that the Words "Any Person" Do Not Include the Unborn.**

The history of the criminal abortion statutes proves that the

---

[44] The *Motion to Allow Counsel to Represent Children Unborn and Born Alive* (filed in this case, and incorporated by reference) describes the Court's procedures.

framers of the Fourteenth Amendment did not intend its guarantee of life to "any person" to exclude the unborn.

When the Amendment was adopted in 1868, over three-fourths of the ratifying States had already enacted statutes which made abortion at any stage of gestation a crime.[45] Within a few years, these criminal statutes were universal.

The ancient common law supposed that life commenced at "quickening" - when the mother felt the child stir in her womb. But judicial revision makes it impossible for the Court to assert with assurance that the common law in 1868 was any different than the abortion statutes supplanting it. As one Court observed:

> By the ancient common law...as the life of an infant was not supposed to begin until it stirred in the mother's womb, it was not regarded as a criminal offense to commit an abortion in the early stages of pregnancy. A considerable change in the law has taken place in many jurisdictions by the silent and steady progress of judicial opinion; and it has been frequently held by Courts of high character that abortion is a crime at common law without regard to the stage of gestation.[46]

---

[45] The statutes are set out in Quay, *Justifiable Abortion, Medical and Legal Foundations*, 49 Geo. L. J. 447-520 (1961).

[46] *Lamb* v. *State*, 67 Md. 524 (1887). Some state supreme courts ruled that the common law made abortion at any stage of gestation a crime. *Mills* v. *Comm.*, 13 Pa. 631 (1850); *State* v. *Slagle*, 83 N.C. 544 (1880); *State* v. *Reed*, 45 Ark. 333 (1885). And those state supreme courts which ruled that abortion prior to quickening was not a common law crime were immediately overruled by their legislatures which made abortion at any stage of pregnancy a crime. *Comm.* v. *Parker*, 50 Mass. 263 (1845), was immediately overruled by Mass. Acts & Resolves ch. 27 (1845). *State* v. *Cooper*, 22 N.J.L. 52 (1849), was immediately overruled by N.J. Laws at 266 (1849). *Abrahams* v. *Foshee*, 3 Iowa 274 (1856) was overruled by the next legislature, Iowa Rev. Laws, tit. XXIII, ch. 165. art. 2, sec. 4221 (1860).

By 1868, medical science had long rejected the ancient notion that life commenced at "quickening." The abortion statutes reflected the views of medical science that there was no time during gestation when the unborn were not alive.

In view of this history, the Court cannot meet its heavy burden to prove that the framers intended to exclude the unborn from the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of life to "any person," so they could be killed for convenience. This evidence is fatal to *Roe* v. *Wade*.

Thus the Court needed to rewrite 19th century medicine and law. The Court fabricated the hypothesis that the 19th century abortion statutes were intended to protect only the mothers, not the unborn. This suggested that the American people never intended the lives of the unborn to be protected by law. This hypothesis was fabricated as follows.

1.

The Court first asserted as fact, "When most criminal abortion laws were first enacted, the procedure was a hazardous one for the woman." *Roe* v. *Wade*, 410 U.S. at 148. The Court claimed that abortions, even by physicians, were hazardous to the woman.

The only authority the Court cited to prove its assertion was a 20th century medical history book.[47] But this book only described the hazards of major surgery in general prior to Lister's discovery of antiseptics. The abortion operation was not mentioned anywhere in the entire book.

The 19th century obstetric authorities throughout the Western world prove that abortions by physicians were "perfectly safe" to the woman.[48] The Court did not examine

---

[47] Haagensen and Lloyd, *A Hundred Years of Medicine* 19 (1943), cited in *Roe v Wade*, 410 U.S. at 148 n.43.

[48] 2 T. Denman, M.D., *An Introduction to the Practice of Midwifery* 96 (1802). He was a standard English authority. A French physician wrote

even one of these obstetric textbooks. They prove the Court's assertion of fact, "the procedure was a hazardous one for the woman," to be false.

The Court never revealed the hazardous abortion procedure to which it was referring. Actually, the 19th century physicians generally used the ancient method,[49] which one physician traced back 2000 years,[50] and which they described as "perfectly safe" to the woman.

Since abortions by physicians were not hazardous to the mother, the only motivating purpose the abortion statutes could have had was to protect the lives of the unborn from destruction by abortions. Had it been the purpose of the legislators to only protect the mother, they would have simply required abortions to be performed by physicians.

2.

The Court next asserted as fact, "Abortion mortality was high."[51] The Court cited no authority to support it.

The Court intended this assertion to prove that physicians were killing so many women with abortions that women needed legislation to protect them from the medical profession.

"experience has proved that the dangers of the operation are reduced to a small matter." A.L.M. Velpeau, M.D., *A Complete Treatise on Midwifery* 530 (4th Am. ed. 1852). The preeminent American physician wrote "to the mother there is very little danger." H.L. Hodge, M.D., *The Principles and Practice of Obstetrics* 293 (1864).

[49] Dr. Denman, a standard authority in England, wrote in 1802: 'the membranes of the ovum are punctured," which permitted "the discharge of the waters," which induced the "action of the uterus," which resulted in the expulsion of the fetus from the womb, which was "perfectly safe" to the woman. 2 T. Denman, *An Introduction to the Practice of Midwifery* 96-99 (1802).

[50] F. Ramsbotham, M.D., *The Principles and Practice of Obstetric Medicine* 724 (4th ed. 1856).

[51] *Roe* v. *Wade*, 410 U.S. at 149.

The 19th century obstetric authorities prove this assertion to be false. The obstetric texts show that abortions by physicians were "perfectly safe" to women.

3.

The Court next asserted the conclusion it derived from these two false assertions of fact:

> "[A] State's real concern in enacting a criminal abortion law was to protect the pregnant woman, that is, to restrain her from submitting to a procedure that placed her life in serious jeopardy." *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. at 149.

This is a false inference, drawn from two false assertions of fact.

The evidence shows these abortion statutes were intended to protect the unborn. The 19th century treatises on criminal law stated that the foetus was "a living being immediately after conception" and these abortion statutes were intended to protect the lives of the unborn during all stages of gestation.[52] And State supreme courts ruled that these abortion statutes protected the lives of the unborn.[53] And authors of the statutes said their purpose was to protect the unborn.[54]

An 1860 study by the American Medical Association contrasted the striking difference between safe abortions by physicians, and lethal abortions by criminals:

> "In thirty-four cases of criminal abortion ... twenty-two were followed... by death, and only twelve were not. In

---

[52] 1 F. Wharton, *A Treatise on the Criminal Law of the United States* 656-57 (5th ed. 1861).

[53] *Smith* v. *State*, 33 Me 48 (1851).

[54] See quotes, *infra* pages 23-24, of Joynes, who authored the Virginia statute, and of the AMA, which proffered a model statute to the States.

fifteen cases necessarily induced by physicians, not one was fatal." H.R. Storer, M.D., *On Criminal Abortion in America* 43 (1860).

Since abortions by physicians were known all over the western world to be safe to women, the motivating purpose of these abortion statutes could only have been to protect the lives of unborn children from destruction by abortions. Since legislatures prohibited safe abortions by physicians, despite the great danger to the mother from abortions by criminals, it proves that their motivating concern was to protect unborn life.

4.

The Court then concluded, "the word 'person,' as used in the Fourteenth Amendment, does not include the unborn." *Roe* v. *Wade*, 410 U.S. at 158.

The Court could not find even one 19th century authority to support this result.

In view of these abortion statutes, the Court cannot prove that the people who framed and adopted the Fourteenth Amendment intended its guarantee of life to "any person" to exclude the unborn, so they could be killed for convenience.

5.

The Court resurrected the ancient view that life commenced at "quickening" (about four months gestation) and arbitrarily expanded that to "viability" (about seven months gestation). Yet, by the time the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted, both science and law had rejected the ancient view.

A physician, who helped draft Virginia's 1848 state abortion statute, explained that science had rejected the ancient view that life began at quickening:

"(T)hat the embryo is endowed with an inherent vitality from the first moment of conception, and is therefore as

much entitled to the protection of the law before the period of "quickening" as after it, every well-informed physician must yield a ready assent. The old doctrine, once held by medical men...that the foetus first becomes animated, or endowed with distinct vitality, at the moment when the sensation of quickening is experienced by the mother, has been long since banished from the domain of science ... and now only finds a retreat in the dark and ancient caverns of common law...."

"(T)he civil rights of the unborn child are perfect from the very commencement of its being."

L.S. Joynes, M.D, "Foetus in Utero," *Virginia Medical Journal* 179-180, 187 (1856).

In 1860 the President of the American Medical Association condemned that ancient view as a "barbarous physiology" and urged the States to enact statutes to protect all stages of unborn life:

"This relic of a barbarous physiology needs to be exploded, and the truth should be generally promulgated, that, from the moment of conception, a new being is engendered." 13 *Transactions of the American Medical Association* 56-7 (1860)

And America's eminent professor of obstetric medicine wrote in 1860:

From the moment of fecundation, the new being becomes independent...its individuality is complete....(T)here is a progressive...advancing from one degree of perfection to another. Every protection, therefore, which is extended by human legislation to the young infant...should be equally effectual in securing the life of the embryo from

the earliest period of its existence.[55]

But the Court adopted a view of unborn life which 19th century medical science had rejected as "a barbarous physiology," which courts had ruled "never ought to have been the law anywhere,"[56] and which legislatures had condemned as criminal.

In construing the phrase in its constitution, "Everybody has the right to life," the Supreme Court of West Germany ruled that the word "everybody" did include the unborn, and the State had a duty to protect unborn life: "No distinction can be made among the several stages of developing life before birth, or between prenatal and postnatal life."

The medical and legal history show the framers and adopters of the Fourteenth Amendment made this same conclusion when they guaranteed life to "any person" without any exceptions for the unborn. They decided that unborn life was a progressive advancing from one degree of perfection to another, and there was no time when the unborn were not alive and the law could withdraw its protection of life.

Chief Justice Marshall ruled that the intention of the framers is the law, and for the Court to disobey it would be "treason to the Constitution." So the Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person" does include the unborn.

The Court claims that it can fabricate evidence to exclude anyone from the U.S. Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person." In effect, the Court claims FALSEHOOD IS TRUTH.

---

[55] H.L. Hodge, M.D., *The Principles and Practice of Obstetrics* 78 (1864). Hodge's "name had become a household word throughout the land" and his book "valued among the very first works on obstetrics ever issued from the American or foreign press." R. Penrose, M.D., *Discourse on Life of H.L. Hodge* 20-21 (1872).

[56] *Mills* v. *Comm.*, 13 Pa. at 632 (1850).

E.

Due Process of Law Has Compelled the U.S. Supreme Court to Confess in Court that it Is Guilty of Mass Murder and Extermination.

For the **129th time**, the U.S. Supreme Court is accused of defying the Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person" and deliberately exterminating millions of victims whom the Constitution endeavors to preserve.

For the **105th time,** the U.S. Supreme Court is accused of mass murder in violation of state and federal criminal statutes.

For the **109th time**, the U.S. Supreme Court is accused of using criminal procedures to effect and maintain its *Roe v Wade* killings.

But, for three decades, the Court has never attempted to refute the charges.

Failure to deny a charge is admissible as a confession that the charge is true.[57]

At his trial for treason in 399 B.C., Socrates cross-examined one of his accusers: "(Y)ou are silent, and have nothing to say. But is not this rather disgraceful, and a very considerable proof of what I was saying?"

And this Court recognizes this ancient rule:

> "(T)he Court has consistently recognized that...silence in the face of accusation is a relevant fact.... Silence is often evidence of the most persuasive character." *Baxter* v. *Palmigiano*, 425 U.S. at 319 (1976).

Under the Court's own rulings, its silence is an admission

---

[57] 4 Wigmore, *Evidence*, Sec. 1071-1073 (Chadborn rev. 1972). "Underlying the rule is the assumption that human nature prompts an innocent man to deny false accusations and consequently a failure to deny a particular accusation tends to prove belief in the truth of the accusation." *McCormick on Evidence*, Sec. 161 (1972).

that the charges are true:

> "Failure to contest an assertion, however, is considered evidence of acquiescence only if it would have been natural under the circumstances to object to the assertion in question." *United States v. Hale*, 422 U.S. 171, 176 (1975).

The circumstances leave no doubt that the court's silence is a confession that the charges are true.

First, the evidence proves the charges to be true. The Court decreed killings to be "liberty" which States had defined to be "murder." This is mere historical fact. No denial is possible. As Chief Justice John Marshall wrote, "a fact which has existed cannot be made never to have existed."[58]

Second, the charges were made in court, the place designated by law to hear such accusations. The Judges had a legal duty to refute the charges, if they could. Chief Justice John Marshall ruled that judges who "close their eyes on the Constitution" and "condemn to death those victims whom the Constitution endeavors to preserve" commit "crime."[59] The Court had a legal duty to fully hear allegations that Roe v. Wade was wrongly decided, and to obey the evidence.

Third, the Court's steadfast silence for three decades in the face of scores of accusations is unparalleled in the legal history of the world. The Court itself cited this circumstance as making confession by silence more trustworthy:

> "Silence gains more probative weight where it persists in the face of accusation, since it is assumed in such circumstances that the accused would be more likely than not to dispute an untrue accusation." *United States* v.

---

[58] *Marbury* v. *Madison*, 1 Cranch 137, 167 (1803).

[59] *Marbury* v. *Madison*, 1 Cranch 137, 179-180 (1803).

Hale, 422 U.S. 171, 176 (1975).

Fourth, the evidence showed the United States was being ruled by a giant conspiracy to exterminate and mass murder, to overthrow the U.S. Constitution, and to impose Nazi doctrines on America. Never in history had it ever been more imperative to deny charges if they were untrue.

And **fifth**, the Justices met the charges in court by claiming that they must be obeyed even if they decreed the mass murder of Jews, or anyone else, to be liberty.

A government of laws can permit only one conclusion to be drawn from these facts: the U.S. Supreme Court confessed that the charges are true.

III.

IF *ROE* v. *WADE* IS A MISTAKE OF LAW, THEN ALL PUBLIC OFFICIALS, OR CITIZENS, WHO SUPPORT IT MAY BE GUILTY OF COMPLICITY IN EXTERMINATION, INCLUDING MASS MURDER.

We now arrive at the most important legal question in world history: Can the U.S. Supreme Court lawfully decree national extermination and mass murder to be liberty? The U.S. Supreme Court claims that it can.

But if *Roe* v. *Wade* is a mistake of law, then all the government officials, news media persons or citizens who helped to support and maintain it may be guilty of complicity in national extermination, including mass murder.

The general rule is that mistake of law is no excuse for breaking the law.[60] The Constitution's *ex post facto* provisions do not apply to judicial decisions which are a mistake of law.[61] The limited affirmative defense of reasonable reliance on an

---

[60] R. Perkins, *Criminal Law* 920 (2d ed. 1969); Oliver Wendell Holmes, *The Common Law* 41 (Howe ed. 1963).

[61] *Ross* v. *Oregon*, 227 U.S. 150, 161 (1912).

official judicial opinion, thereafter determined to be a mistake of law, does not apply in homicide cases, much less national extermination and mass murder.[62] But even if it did, no reliance on *Roe v. Wade* could be reasonable in view of the above facts. So the law applied at Nuremberg applies here. Obedience to the decrees of the supreme judge is no defense to national extermination and mass murder.

Even if the U.S. Supreme Court held a gun to a man's head, and threatened death unless he obeyed *Roe v. Wade*, it would not be a defense to homicide. Blackstone stated the law: "(H)e ought rather to die himself than escape by the murder of an innocent."

In explaining why the Western democracies bowed to violence and the Nazis got away with monstrous crimes, Winston Churchill merely quoted Machiavelli: "Men avenge slight injuries, but not grave ones." Thus America is now ruled by a giant conspiracy to mass murder.

"Political language," wrote George Orwell, "is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable." In his novel *1984*, Orwell described a tyranny which claimed, "Whatever the Party holds to be truth is truth," and defrauded its subjects into obedience with its slogans "FREEDOM IS SLAVERY" and "WAR IS PEACE."

This science fiction may appear implausible, yet for three decades the United States has been ruled by a Court which claims, "Whatever the Court holds to be truth is truth," and maintains obedience with its slogans- MASS MURDER IS LIBERTY, FALSEHOOD IS TRUTH, and TREASON IS LAW.

But all that will be swept away. The primitive idea, that

---

[62] *Model Penal Code*, Section 2.04, Ignorance or Mistake (Proposed Official Draft 1962) and comments in the *Model Penal Code*, Tentative Draft No. 4, Comments on Sec. 2.04, page 138. R. Perkins, *Criminal Law* 928 (2d ed. 1969). A. Ernest, *Mass Murder is Liberty* 74-104 (1998)

some can gain by killing others, has no future. The message of our Declaration of Independence becomes more true every day - reverence for life is the only path to the future. Wherever we are, wherever in the universe our kind may go, our essential thought, the thought necessary for us to exist, will always be reverence for life.

CONCLUSION

Merely overruling *Roe* v. *Wade* will not remedy the wrong. The Court misguided this nation and the entire world. Now the Court must speak the obvious truth. The U.S. Constitution's guarantee of life to "any person" does include the unborn. State and federal governments have a duty to protect unborn life.

Alan Ernest,
Counsel